

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/064,085	06/10/2002		Steinar Bjaerum	15-DS-00564	7101
23446	7590	09/21/2004		EXAMINER	
		LD & MALLOY,	IMAM, ALI M		
500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3737	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/064,085	BJAERUM ET AL.
ravioury riodion	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ali Imam	3737 .
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 04 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic I) a timely filed amendment which al (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	•
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		• —
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10. Other:		
		the Mare

Ali Imam Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3737 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the overlaying step and structure is based on user input which is not taught by the current applied prior arts. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lizuka . teaches in Fig. 7C a user interface enabling a user to overlay the ùmage on the display with a first pattern of indicia which inherently suggests that the overlaying step and structure is based on user input.